

Questions pertaining to the requirement for a single vendor application. A response to these questions is below.

1. This is for a single vendor, correct? If so, how does a shovel ready, good EVSE site host make sure it's included? Thx
2. Just confirming the new application that just came out is not for individual applications (putting EVC stations at our train lot) but for a more comprehensive installation in four different locations on those corridors?
3. Are you looking for one entity to be responsible for all of the infrastructure for all corridors?
4. Will only one applicant be selected for the entire solicitation amount?
5. What is the reasoning to limit the project(s) to one applicant for all locations?
6. Are you selecting only one vendor or a mix?
7. Why are you addressing this via one RFP versus a site host application/rebate process? This will likely limit the number of options for the state.
8. Do RFP responses need to address all of the corridors in one application?
9. Can applicants propose a solution that encompasses just a proportion of the priority corridor network? If so, does scoring take into account the breadth of the area of the network being proposed?
10. What led to the State decide to limit the award of this contract to one vendor/applicant rather than potentially having a variety of stations in the State?

Response:

The RFP is soliciting a single vendor to install a limited number of charging stations on a portion of NH's travel corridors. This approach was selected to ensure we receive proposals that include charging solutions for all areas of the state, not just the southern, more populated portions of New Hampshire, or the most traveled corridors. To enable travel via EV throughout New Hampshire charging infrastructure is needed in all areas of the state. After extensive consideration, and consultation with other states, it was determined that only by requiring a "package deal" would we be able to get proposals for the less traveled areas.

This RFP is not intended to fund the totality of DC fast chargers that will ultimately be needed in New Hampshire to enable and encourage the broad adoption of EVs in New Hampshire and the Northeast. Rather this RFP is intended as a good first step, one that will make travel throughout the state more feasible and thus the adoption of EVs more attractive.

Any proposals that do not provide a solution for all specified corridors will not be accepted or evaluated.

Questions pertaining to potential site hosts. A response to these questions is below.

1. How will respondents to the RFP become aware of specific host-site locations?
2. How does a shovel ready, good EVSE site host make sure it's included?

Response:

Any potential site host that would like to share their contact information with potential bidders may submit that information to Timothy.White@des.nh.gov. This contact information will be posted on the publically available VW funding page of the OSI website.

Question: Is there any plan to do an RFP for other locations such as ours or are all of the VW funds going toward this RFP?

Response: *New Hampshire's Beneficiary Mitigation Plan allots the maximum allowable 15 percent of the funds, approximately \$4.6 million, for EV charging infrastructure. There will be additional solicitations for EVSE. However, nothing has been scheduled at this time. All solicitations will be posted here: <https://www.nh.gov/osi/energy/programs/vw-trust-funding.htm>*

Question: Is it safe to assume that 9 miles is too far off the corridor to be considered for a charging location?

Response: *The RFP states that it is preferred that sites be within 1.5 miles of a named route or highway in rural areas and within 0.25 miles of a named route or highway in urban areas in order to qualify for on-road signage pursuant to NHDOT policy. Although sites not meeting these criteria may be proposed, excessive distance from the named route will be reflected in the scoring of the proposal.*

Question: Can a 5-year maintenance agreement for the EVSE be included as an eligible cost if it is paid for up front as a capital expense. This approach has been taken in numerous Volkswagen Settlement funded programs including programs in Maine, Rhode Island, Oklahoma, Colorado, and North Carolina. We recommend that DES/OSI consider it be included as an eligible cost in this RFP.

Response: *Per Section 2.5 of the RFP, sub-paragraphs 2.c and 2.m, capital costs and costs for maintenance are not eligible costs.*

Question: Can a 5-year software subscription for the EVSE be included as an eligible cost if it is paid for up front as a capital expense. This approach has been taken in numerous Volkswagen Settlement funded programs including programs in Maine, Rhode Island, Oklahoma, Colorado, and North Carolina. We recommend that DES consider it be included as an eligible cost in this RFP.

Response: *Per Section 2.5 of the RFP, sub-paragraphs 2.c and 2.k, capital costs and costs for software are not eligible costs.*

Question: The RFP states that "applicants must propose a solution in which the selected Applicant will be the owner of the EVSE". Can the Applicant propose a solution in which a 3rd party such as the site host/property owner will own and operate the EVSE so long as the Applicant remains contractually

obligated for the continued operation of the EVSE in compliance with the Contract terms and conditions? ChargePoint has leveraged this approach in numerous grant programs to successfully deploy more than 100,000 charging stations across the United States.

Response: *No. The applicant must maintain ownership of the equipment for the contract period.*

Question: Can you please clarify the operation and maintenance requirement that states: “Ensuring the DCFC EVSE is operational at least 97 percent of the time based on a schedule of 24 hours per day and seven days per week”. This would suggest that downtime will be measured on a weekly basis with only 5 hours of downtime allowed. We recommend measuring downtime on an annual basis which would allow for approximately 11 days or 263 hours of downtime which is a reasonable and achievable goal.

Response: *OSI and NHDES have reconsidered this requirement and will issue an amendment to the RFP to specify that the equipment must be operational 97 percent of the time on an annual basis.*

Question: The RFP states that “in the event a site visit is required to address a maintenance issue, the service personnel should arrive at the site within twenty-four (24) hours of the Applicant receiving notification of the problem.” We recommend that this requirement be removed and that the operation and maintenance requirement simply be that “the DCFC EVSE is operational at least 97% of the time”. It is not feasible to dispatch service personnel within 24 hours of receiving notification of the problem with any and all parts that might be needed to repair a station. A 97% uptime requirement based on a schedule of 365 days per year would allow for approximately 11 days or 263 hours of downtime which is a reasonable and achievable goal.

Response: *See question above regarding allowable down-time. Regarding the site visit requirement, this requirement is intended to ensure a timely response to a maintenance issue. If a site visit is necessary to diagnose the cause of an issue then the site visit must be made within 24 hours.*

Question: Are administrative costs associated with the site acquisition, site license agreement negotiation, and design phase eligible? The RFP currently says that only “administrative costs related to the construction phase” are eligible.

Response: *Administrative costs associated with site acquisition and site license agreement are not eligible. Site design is considered to be a part of the construction phase that occurs once a site has been acquired.*

Question: We recommend that DES/OSI reconsider grid interconnection costs being a non-eligible cost. Grid interconnection costs if borne solely by the Applicant may prove to be cost prohibitive and potentially eliminate critical locations from consideration. Grid interconnection costs have been eligible in numerous Volkswagen Settlement funded programs including programs in Maine, Rhode Island, Oklahoma, Colorado, and North Carolina.

Response: *This requirement will not be reconsidered.*

Question: Would DES/OSI be willing to reconsider increasing the percentage of eligible costs that will be reimbursed from 80% to 90% or even 100% for EVSE that will be located on government owned property as is permitted by the Volkswagen Consent Decree?

Response: *This requirement will not be reconsidered.*

Questions pertaining to Section 4.2, subsection 2.c, which identifies requirements for the types of point of sale methods that charging stations must support.

Question: Can you please confirm whether the intent of Section 2.C is to be consistent with SB 575 of 2018, which adopted a statutory requirement for payment methods at public electric vehicle (“EV”) charging stations in New Hampshire that is consistent with similar statutory requirements across New England?

Response: *The requirement of Section 4.2, subsection 2.c is consistent with SB 575 and also requires each site to have chip and tap credit card readers.*

Question: Can you please clarify which interpretation of the requirement in Section 2.C is accurate:

- a. EV charging equipment can only be eligible if it processes credit and debit card transactions with a physical EMV chip reader, as opposed to other methods of processing credit and debit card transactions.
- b. EV charging equipment that does not use a physical EMV chip reader as the specific method for processing credit and debit card transactions are eligible, provided that such equipment includes other point of sale methods (e.g., EMV contactless, or “tap-to-pay”, credit and debit cards; payment through mobile app; RFID card; Apple, Android, Samsung Pay; and the ability to initiate a charging session and payment via credit and debit card by phone)

Response: *The requirement of Section 4.2, subsection 2.c requires each site to have chip and tap credit card readers.*

Question: What types of entities are eligible for funding?

Response: *The RFP refers to seeking “a qualified Applicant to provide a strategic network of EVSE and associated operations, maintenance and management services along specified corridors in New Hampshire.”*

Question: What is the number of stations each applicant is expected to construct?

Response: *The RFP does not specify how many charging sites an applicant should propose, rather it asks applicants to propose a solution for the named corridors. The number of sites proposed will be determined by the applicant based on the length of a given corridor, the amount of funding*

(approximately \$2 million) available, and the cost to develop each site. The stations constructed under this RFP are not intended to provide the ideal spacing between charging stations of 50 to 70 miles on all corridors.

Question: Is this program stackable with other funding sources?

Response: *Under this RFP up to 80 percent of eligible costs, up to approximately \$2 million, can be reimbursed from the NH Trust. Applicants may include the use of other funding sources to propose a more robust solution provided such funds are shown to be available to the applicant and are not speculative.*

Question: Could you point me to the site/signage requirements for the RFP?

Response: *Site requirements are in Section 4.1 of the RFP. Signage requirements are in Section 4.1.5 of the RFP.*

Question: Which utility company would be servicing the site?

Response: *The electric utility that provides service for a given area, is the utility that would serve a given site.*

Question: Are there restrictions on who receives the charging session income?

Response: *No.*

QUESTIONS FROM THE WEBINAR ON 12/06/19

Questions pertaining to the webinar presentation:

1. Can attendees to this webinar receive a copy of today's chartpak?
2. Will this presentation be available to municipalities at a later time?

Response: *The recording of this webinar is available on New Hampshire's VW website at <https://www.nh.gov/osi/energy/programs/vw-trust-funding.htm>*

Question: What is the other money not used for EV charging stations of the VW grant used for? Why so little of the available funds are used for EV charging sites? How have the funds been divided into the variety of ways it will be used?

Response: *New Hampshire has committed to using the maximum amount of the VW Trust Fund as allowed under the terms of the Trust for EV charging infrastructure, which is 15 percent of a state's allotment. For New Hampshire this is approximately \$4.6 million. This RFP is Round 1 for the use of this portion of the NH Trust Fund. There will be additional solicitations in the future for EV charging infrastructure.*

Question: Is there expertise available to help with development of these RFPs?

Response: *The State is not providing any assistance to potential applicants for proposal development. Applicants are free to seek assistance from private sector experts in developing a response to the RFP.*

Question: Are the requirements to have an EV site all paid for by the grant money? or does a municipality have to pay for some of the requirements?

Response: *Up to 80 percent of eligible costs will be reimbursed, requiring the selected applicant to fund the remaining 20 percent.*

Question: Is there a reason why these requirements are so demanding and comprehensive with so little support for the total cost of the EV station? Do other states have these requirements?

Response: *The installation and successful operation of EVSE requires a significant amount of expertise. This RFP includes criteria and requirements that have been required in many other states.*

Question: Are you an obstructionist to renewable energy transitions?

Response: *No.*

Question: Is NHDES aware of any best practices zoning and code language for communities along the corridor? There may be some technical assistance that RPCs can provide communities on this issue.

Response: *Through the Transportation and Climate Initiative the mid-Atlantic and Northeast states have developed best practices guidance documents relative to zoning and codes that can be accessed at the following links:*

[*Electric Vehicle Siting and Design Guidelines*](#)

[*EV-Ready Codes for the Built Environment*](#)

[*Creating EV-Ready Towns and Cities: A Guide to Planning and Policy Tools*](#)

Other resources may also exist.

Question regarding eligible and non-eligible costs: Am I understanding correctly that the utility-side work (everything in front of the meter) is eligible under the VW settlement funds, but the site host-side work (behind the meter) is not? Please clarify.

Response: *Your understanding is not correct. Eligible costs under this solicitation include many “behind the meter” expenses (i.e. non-utility expenditures), but do not include utility-side “in front of the meter” expenditures. In some utility areas the utility may be providing “make-ready” service for ESVE, meaning that any utility system upgrades necessary to support the EVSE will be done at the utilities expense. Those costs are not eligible for reimbursement. The utility cost worksheet is required as part of the application to provide information relative to the feasibility of a proposed site, but those costs are not to be included as part of the proposal cost.*

Question: Is this program limited to communities within 1.5 miles of the major corridors?

Response: *No. Applicants may propose EVSE sites that are farther from the named corridors. However, because the purpose of this solicitation is to enable travel throughout the state proposals that include sites that are closer to the major travel corridors may score better.*

OSI may offer future solicitations, either for DC Fast Charging or for Level 2 charging, that will better serve those areas farther from the major travel corridors.

Question: It seems like rural communities are going to be excluded. Is there anything rural communities in Cheshire, Sullivan, Carroll, and Coos County can do?

Response: *The RFP was designed as a statewide package specifically to ensure that the more rural parts of the state were not excluded in a vendor’s proposed solution. In the evaluation and scoring of proposals the location of proposed EVSE along the named corridors, and more specifically whether the proposed solution covers an entire corridor or just the more urban parts of a corridor, will be taken into consideration.*

Question: Has any representative from ChargePoint or another vendor had any influence in helping write any portion of this RFP prior to the release of this RFP?

Response: *No.*

Question: Will the RFP funding include defraying costs of innovative technology (solar, battery storage) that meets the state's desire for innovation?

Response: *The cost of renewable energy and energy storage components are included in Eligible Costs. Applicants should keep in mind the need to balance the total proposal cost with innovative proposals and are directed to Section 6.2 of the RFP – Scoring.*

QUESTIONS RECEIVED AFTER THE WEBINAR

Question: Is there a minimum or maximum amount of stations are you looking for as it is pretty vague just listing the corridors and not how many locations you are looking to fund?

Response: *The RFP requires at least one site on each corridor. It is understood that the funding offered is not adequate to support charging sites at the ideal 50 to 70 mile intervals on all corridors. Superior solutions will likely propose more than one site on the longer corridors and include sites located in the more rural areas of the state.*

Question: Does the state have a desire to have the hardware be OCPP compliant?

Response: *Yes, the hardware must be compliant with the Open Charge Point Protocol. It is an oversight that this requirement was not included in Section 4.1, Section 3. An amendment to the RFP will include this requirement.*

Question: Why can't a site host be the owner of a station?

Question: Can the Applicant propose a solution in which a 3rd party such as the site host/property owner will own and operate the EVSE so long as the Applicant remains contractually obligated for the continued operation of the EVSE in compliance with the Contract terms and conditions?

Response: *The State contractual agreement will be with a single Applicant. If, during the contract period, a station becomes inoperable or is removed the State will have recourse based on the contract terms and conditions. If the equipment were to be owned by a third party, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to recover the State's investment. This decision was based on input from other states that have funded DCFC sites. The Applicant and the site host may develop an agreement that after the term of the State contract the site host will own the station.*

Question: "Necessary upgrades of electrical supply" is an eligible cost but "electrical infrastructure on the property and/or grid interconnection costs" is a non-eligible cost. Can you please specifically clarify what is eligible with respect to upgrades of electrical supply? Is a new transformer and switchgear that is necessary and solely dedicated for the EVSE an eligible cost?

Response: Electrical supply upgrades that will be owned by the Applicant (or site host) will likely be deemed an eligible cost, while utility upgrades (for which a customer may be charged) are not an eligible cost. An evaluation of each proposal will be necessary to determine eligibility.